

or law enforcement agencies will be able to provide a loving home for such deserving animals.

Through the passage of this legislation, not only will the military working dog be taken from a permanently caged status, but the dog will also be given the opportunity for a positive home environment. I know you will agree that after a lifetime of service, there can be no better reward for both handler and dog.

In closing, H.R. 5314 has been endorsed by the Humane Society of the United States, the American Veterinary Medical Association, the Society for Animal Protective Legislation, the Doris Day Animal Rights League, and The American Society for the prevention of Cruelty to Animals. This is a positive measure which is a win-win solution for dog, handler and the Department of Defense.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to Senator WARNER from William W. Putney, DVM. He was a C.O. of the War Dog Training School at Camp Lejeune, NC, was awarded the Silver Star for his bravery during his command of a "war dog" platoon in the 3rd Marine Division during World War II.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOODLAND HILLS, CA,  
October 18, 2000.

Senator JOHN WARNER,  
Chairman, Committee on Armed Forces,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNER: I was born in Prince Edward County Virginia. Attended Virginia Tech (VPI then) then graduated from Auburn University in 1943. I immediately went into the Marine Corps and served throughout the war as a line officer in the war dog program and later as the Chief Veterinarian, USMC. Although I am not a constituent of yours, I have many relatives, living in Virginia, that are. I was the platoon leader of the 2nd and 3rd Marine War Dog Platoons that served with the 3rd Marine Division on Guadalcanal, Guam and Iwo Jima and the 2nd Marine Division on Saipan, Okinawa and Japan.

After the cessation of hostilities, I was C.O. of the War Dog Training School at Camp Lejeune, NC when we detraind and returned to civilian life our dogs that we used in WWII on places like Guadalcanal, Bougainville, Kuajalien, Enwetok, Guam, Pelelieu, Saipan, Okinawa and Japan. Our dogs saved a lot of Marines' lives including mine.

Of the 550 Marine war dogs that we had on duty at the end of the war, only four were destroyed due to our inability to detrain them sufficiently to be returned safely to civilian life. Never to my knowledge was there a recorded an instance where any one of those dogs ever attacked or bit anyone. It is not true that once a dog has had attack training, it can never be released safely into the civilian population. All of our dogs were attack trained.

I strongly support Senator Smith in his efforts to change present DoD policy that once a dog has received attack training, it will always be destroyed when he can no longer perform his military duties.

To use animals for our own use and then destroy them arbitrarily when they can no longer be of use to us is the worst kind of animal abuse.

WILLIAM W. PUTNEY, DVM,  
Captain, USMC, WWII.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. He offers his strong support for a change in the law that will allow the adoption of military working dogs. Former Marine Lt. Putney led a successful effort to build a cemetery and monument for the 25 dogs who died in the liberation of Guam in 1944, and I applaud his work to memorialize their contribution to preventing more loss of life during WWII. I also want to have printed for the RECORD an article that provides some details of his military life and his accomplishments in recognizing the special canine contribution to our wartime successes.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 3, 1995]  
MARINE, NOW 75, HONORED FOR HIS WARTIME  
COURAGE

(By Doyle McManus)

Marine Lt. William W. Putney was awarded the Silver Star for bravery on Saturday—at the age of 75, half a century after the end of his war.

Putney, a Woodland Hills veterinarian, commanded a "war dog" platoon in the 3rd Marine Division during World War II—a little-known specialty that used trained dogs both to guard American positions and sniff out enemy troops hidden in tunnels or caves.

On July 26, 1944, Putney's unit was defending 3rd Marine headquarters on Guam when the lieutenant, then 24, spotted a Japanese platoon heading toward the division hospital.

"Putney ordered the war dog handlers to tie their dogs to bushes and take up a firing line in the path of the enemy." His citation reads, "An enemy machine gun emplacement savagely opened fire. . . . Disregarding his own safety, (Putney) unhesitatingly arose from his position of cover, and standing exposed to the hail of bullets aimed at him, began firing."

"He succeeded in silencing the machine gun and killing the two enemy machine gunners. Although wounded, he exhorted the platoon to press the attack, resulting in the killing of all enemy soldiers, including the Japanese officer leading the attack."

Officials said Putney had been recommended for a decoration during the war but unaccountability did not receive one. His former commanding officer resubmitted the recommendation a few years ago, and Navy Secretary John H. Dalton approved it in time for Putney to formally receive the award at the Punchbowl military cemetery here as part of Saturday's commemoration of the end of World War II.

After the war, Putney served as chief veterinarian and commander of the U.S. Army War Dog Training School. He retired from the Marines and practiced as a veterinarian in Woodland Hills.

In recent years, he led a successful effort to build a cemetery and monument for the 25 Doberman pinschers and German shepherds who died in the liberation of Guam in 1944.

The memorial, which includes the names of the dogs and a life-size bronze statue of a Doberman, was dedicated in a military ceremony last year.

## TESTING NORTH KOREA'S COMMITMENT TO PEACE

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, today I rise to discuss the momentous changes underway on the Korean Peninsula and to take note of the contributions of one extraordinary American public servant to the cause of peace there. Former Secretary of Defense Bill Perry stepped down this month as special adviser to the President on Korea policy, a role he assumed when our relations with North Korea were in crisis and when congressional faith in our approach to the Korean challenge was at a nadir.

It was a job no one coveted. North Korea ranks as one of the most difficult foreign policy challenges we face.

It was a job fraught with risk. Err too far towards confrontation, and you might send North Korea over the brink and start another war. Err too far towards conciliation, and your initiative might be mistaken for appeasement, emboldening the North and undermining political support at home.

Under Bill Perry's leadership, the U.S. launched a hard-headed initiative designed to test North Korea's willingness to abandon the path of confrontation in favor of the road to peace. From its inception, the Perry initiative was predicated on maintenance of a strong military deterrent. But Dr. Perry recognized that deterrence alone was not likely to lure North Korea out of its shell and reduce the threat of war.

The Perry initiative was designed and implemented in concert with our South Korean and Japanese allies, and it continues to enjoy their full support.

The results of this comprehensive and integrated engagement strategy have stunned even the most optimistic observers.

The year began with a mysterious and unprecedented visit by Kim Jong-il to the Chinese Embassy in Pyongyang. Over the course of a four-hour dinner, Kim made it plain that the year 2000 would see a shift in the North's approach to reviving its moribund economy and ending its diplomatic isolation.

In quick succession, Kim hosted Russian President Putin and then South Korean President Kim Dae-jung. The historic Korean summit meeting in Pyongyang was a tremendous victory for South Korean President Kim Dae-jung's "Sunshine Policy" and a validation of Perry's engagement strategy. It is fitting that President Kim Dae-jung was just awarded the Nobel Peace prize for his life-long efforts on behalf of peace and democracy on the Korean peninsula.

With the rapid emergence of Kim Jong-il from what he admitted was a "hermit's" existence in North Korea, the prospects for a lasting peace on the peninsula are better today than at any time since the Korean War began more than 50 years ago. Time will tell.

If fully implemented, the agreement reached in Pyongyang by President

Kim Dae-jung and Kim Jong-il promises to reduce tensions in this former war zone and enhance economic, cultural, environmental, and humanitarian cooperation.

There are encouraging signs that the summit meeting was not a fluke:

Family reunification visits are proceeding, albeit at a pace that is slower than the families divided for 50 years desire or deserve.

Ground will be broken soon to restore rail connections across the DMZ, restoring trade and communication links severed for 50 years.

A follow-on meeting of the North and South Korean Defense Ministers in September led to an agreement to resume military contacts and to explore confidence building measures along the DMZ, including notification of exercises and creation of a North-South hot-line.

Planning is proceeding smoothly for next year's North-South summit meeting in Seoul.

There has also been progress in U.S.-North Korean relations. An historic meeting between President Clinton and senior North Korean military officer Cho Myong-nok occurred this month in Washington, setting the stage for next week's first ever visit to the North by an American Secretary of State.

Mr. President, this flurry of diplomatic activity has been dismissed by some critics as all form, and no substance. They marvel at our willingness—and that of our South Korean ally—to provide food aid to a despotic regime that continues to spend precious resources on weapons and military training rather than tractors and agricultural production.

No one condones the North Korean Government's callous disregard for the suffering of its own people. And obviously, much work remains to be done—especially in the security realm—to realize the hope generated by the summits. The North has not withdrawn any of its heavy artillery poised along the Demilitarized Zone.

It has not halted provocative military exercises. It has not yet ended all of its support for terrorist organizations.

And, although the North did reaffirm its moratorium on long-range missile testing this month in Washington, it has not stopped its development or export of long-range ballistic missile technology. North Korea's missile program continues to pose a serious threat not only to our allies South Korea and Japan, but also to other nations confronting the odious clients of North Korea's arms merchants.

All of these issues must be addressed if we are to forge a lasting peace on the Korean peninsula.

Our efforts to engage North Korea must ultimately be matched by reciprocal steps by the North. Engagement is not a one-way street.

But the question is not whether North Korea is a desirable partner for peace. Kim Jong-il has all the appeal of Saddam Hussein. The question is how we manage the North Korean threat.

I can't imagine how the situation would be improved if we did not offer North Korea a chance to choose peace over truculence. I can't imagine how the situation would be improved in any way if North Korean children were dying in droves from malnutrition and disease as they were prior to the launch of the U.S.-funded World Food Program relief efforts.

Mr. President, we should not discount the importance of the recent diplomatic developments on the peninsula. How soon we forget that it was a process called glasnost—openness—combined with maintenance of a strong NATO alliance, which ultimately brought about the demise of the Soviet Union and the reunification of East and West Germany.

Information about the outside world is hard to come by in North Korea, just as it was hard to get in the Soviet Union before detente opened the window and let the Soviet people catch the scent of the fresh air of freedom.

Perhaps dialog with North Korea and greater openness there will bring about a similar result. If so, we will have Secretary Perry to thank for his role in getting that dialog jump-started after it had stalled amidst mutual suspicions and acrimony during the mid-1990s.

Mr. President, in closing I would like to extend my profound thanks to Bill Perry for the way he carried out his responsibilities. He answered the call to public service two years ago, trading the comfort of northern California for the landmine-strewn terrain of Washington and North Korea. He has conducted himself with honor and a strong sense of duty. He will be missed.

The stakes on the peninsula are high. Events there will not only shape the security environment of Northeast Asia, but also affect our decision whether to deploy a limited national missile defense, and if so, what kind of defense. From my perspective, it would be a great accomplishment if we could neutralize the North Korean missile threat through diplomacy rather than spend billions of dollars to construct a missile defense system which might do more harm to our national security than good.

I wish Secretary Albright and her new Korea policy adviser Wendy Sherman well as they strive to build on the momentum generated over the past few months. It is a tough job, but it is incumbent on us to test North Korea's commitment to peace.

#### DEMOCRACY DENIED IN BELARUS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I am pleased to join as an original cosponsor of this resolution introduced by my

colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN, to address the continuing constitutional crisis in Belarus.

As Co-Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, during the 106th Congress I have worked on a bipartisan basis to promote the core values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law in Belarus in keeping with that country's commitments as a participating State in the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Back in April the OSCE set four criteria for international observation of parliamentary elections held this past weekend: respect for human rights and an end to the climate of fear; opposition access to the state media; a democratic electoral code; and the granting of real power to the new parliament.

Regrettably, the Lukashenka regime responded with at best half-hearted measures aimed at giving the appearance of progress while keeping democracy in check. Instead of using the elections process to return Belarus to the path of democracy and end that country's self-isolation, Mr. Lukashenka tightened his grip on power launching an intensified campaign of harassment against the democratic opposition and fledgling independent media. Accordingly, a technical assessment team dispatched by the OSCE concluded that the elections "fell short of meeting minimum commitments for free, fair, equal, accountable, and transparent elections." The President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the OSCE confirmed the flawed nature of the campaign period.

We recently saw how Slobodan Milosevic was swept from power by a wave of popular discontent following years of repression. After his ouster, Belarus now has the dubious distinction of being the sole remaining dictatorship in Europe. Misguided steps toward recognition of the results of Belarus' flawed parliamentary elections would only serve to bolster Mr. Lukashenka in the lead up to presidential elections slated for next year.

This situation was addressed today in an editorial in the Washington Times. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this editorial be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

I commend Senator DURBIN for his leadership on this issue and will continue to work with my colleagues to support the people of Belarus in their quest to move beyond dictatorship to genuine democracy.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Times, Oct. 19, 2000]

#### BATTLE FOR BELARUS

In Belarus last weekend, the opposition leaders did not light their parliament on fire as their Yugoslavian counterparts had the week before. They did not crush the walls of the state media outlet with bulldozers or